

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 15-20 are amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The May 3, 2004 Advisory Action refused entry of the April 12, 2004 Amendment After Final Rejection. This Second Amendment After Final Rejection further adds "to prevent unsafe operation while the vehicle is traveling" to the independent claims.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Abdulselam in the March 16, 2004 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully request acknowledgment of receipt of all certified copies of the priority document filed on October 30, 2000.

I. The claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,593,667 to Onodera et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,850,076 to Morioka et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,025,869 to Stas et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action, at page 3, admits that Onodera et al. does not disclose or suggest an operation nullifying device or canceller, but asserts that Stas et al. discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that Stas et al. and Morioka et al. do not make up for the deficiencies of Onodera et al.

Specifically, as discussed during the interview, Onodera et al., Stas et al. and Morioka et al., individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose or suggest "operation nullification device that prohibits the predetermined operation performed by the operator from being inputted as the operator guidance upon fulfillment of a predetermined traveling condition related to operation of the vehicle," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 4, 15, 16, 18 and 19; and "operation nullification device that nullifies operation performed by the operator for selection of one of a plurality of dummy switches included in the newly displayed information if the summation time period during a traveling condition is longer than a referenced time period, and prohibits new information corresponding to the operated dummy switch from being displayed by the display device," as recited in claim 8, and as similarly recited in claims 17 and 20.

Instead, Morioka discloses an ATM machine to make banking transactions easier and more understandable, especially for those who are handicapped or not familiar with the operation of ATM machines (col. 1, line 55- col. 2, line 12); and Stas et al. discloses a television parental supervision system which can block a list of predetermined channels (col. 2, lines 7-19).

As discussed in the interview, even if considered, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find obvious the nullifying operation for a predetermined traveling condition, or during a traveling condition, as claimed.

For at least the above reasons, Onodera et al., Morioka et al. and Stas et al. would not have rendered obvious the subject matter recited in claims 1-20. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48,360

JAO:RJK/mdw

Date: May 11, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--